

ZT prize National Student Architectural Design Competition '24

Jury Report The jury of “ZT prize National Student Architectural Design Competition '24; “coast” held an online meeting session on 26 June 2024, between 6.00 PM and 10.00 PM (UTC+3) to evaluate all of the 79 qualifying submissions.

All jury members were present during the session and consisted of the following individuals (in alphabetical order of surname):

Namık Günay Erkal, Architect, Prof. Dr. TEDU,

Desen Çizenel, Architect

Jason Liu, Architect

Ozan Sarıkaya, Architect

R. Faruk Şahin, Architect.

Jury Advisory Member **Kaan Tanali** (PE) and rapporteurs **Zeynep Onur** and **Ruya Ozturk** were also present during the jury session.

The jury members appointed Namık Günay Erkal as the jury president.

Preliminary Checks:

Student identification documents, application forms, and project submittals had been checked by the rapporteurs following the submission deadline of 27 May 2024. Out of 84 total submissions, five projects were disqualified due to non-compliance with the Eligibility Requirements explained in the Competition Brief. Those were:

Alias	Reason for disqualification
zt04295	The submittal was in Turkish (i.e. did not follow the language requirements)
zt01812	Late submission
zt29812	The submittal was from landscape architecture students. Per the Eligibility Requirements, only students from Architecture are qualified for this competition.
zt122955	Id and the poster has not been submitted
zt18610	Id and the poster has not been submitted

Anonymity of Entries:

The remaining 79 qualifying projects were given a random number from 01 to 79 by the rapporteurs to provide anonymity and ease of reference. These numbers were digitally covered over the aliases before being shared with the jury members. Projects with these new numbers were shared with the jury members on 05 June 2024 prior to the jury session to allow for a thorough pre-review. The jury

members signed a declaration of honesty indicating they had not seen the projects participating in the competition before the date of 05 June 2024.

First Evaluation Round:

Each project numbered from 01 to 79 was opened to discussion and jointly reviewed by the jury members. The high quality of presentations and the ability to use architectural language to approach the subject were considered common factors in all presented proposals. The variety of ideas brought forward in the proposals was found remarkable. The jury was pleased to see that all the submissions were well presented with proper architectural language, each with unique ideas and remarkable propositions.

However, given the vast number of submissions, 48 projects were unanimously eliminated in the first round due to failing to bring forward a strong architectural concept that seeks to convey “coast”.

The aliases of the eliminated projects are listed as follows:

.05	zt01717	.24	zt16842	.48	zt66096	.64	zt22296
.08	zt08082	.29	zt44444	.49	zt55342	.65	zt07373
.10	zt88756	.30	zt35064	.51	zt03561	.66	zt16783
.11	zt20030	.31	zt263835	.53	zt19538	.67	zt20339
.12	zt26129	.32	zt11740	.54	zt11428	.68	zt52243
.13	zt01216	.35	zt142508	.55	zt08888	.70	zt01523
.14	zt32012	.36	zt01919	.56	zt04618	.73	zt27082
.15	zt00005	.37	zt01001	.58	zt692371	.74	zt51199
.16	zt70420	.38	zt22140	.59	zt28110	.75	zt04296
.17	zt03699	.41	zt05334	.60	zt24090	.76	zt20360
.19	zt13219	.42	zt04545	.61	zt23140	.77	zt16033
.20	zt43802	.46	zt25166	.62	zt01705	.78	zt01789
.22	zt23242	.47	zt05427	.63	zt30246		

The jury voted for the remaining 28 projects to proceed to the second evaluation round.

Second Evaluation Round:

The following 21 projects were eliminated in the second evaluation round with brief justifications as stated below:

01. Zipper (zt31415) The initial idea, with its bold and measured touch on the coastal strip, was found to be sensitive by continuously intertwining the sea and land sides with a twist. However, it was decided to be eliminated in the second round due to remaining in the environmental arrangement phase and lacking a site proposal.

03. Tidal Chain (zt31072) The idea of transforming into different spaces with the effect of tides, incorporating nature into the design in this way, and the idea of having part of the spatial setup in the sea and part on land was found to be positive and valuable. However, it was criticized for remaining at the initial idea stage, being discussed as just an idea, and the spatial proposal was found to be very weak and unsuccessful. Additionally, it was criticized for the fact that such significant changes in sea level

height during the tides would not occur because it is not an ocean. It was decided to be eliminated in this round.

04. vitrin (zt17414) The ideas of increasing the coastal edge and considering the design together with the presence of the city were found to be positive. However, the fact that the city's presence could only be seen from the sea and that there was no other proposal was considered weak. The road extending to the sea was found valuable, but the fact that the multiplied coastal edge remained merely a platform without anything sustaining it and lacking a spatial proposal was criticized. The awareness on the land side was found very positive, but it was discussed that the same success was not achieved on the sea side, indicating an incomplete situation, and it was decided to eliminate it in this round

06. Lost&Hope (zt01425) The idea of establishing a relationship with the submerged area and solving it at the intersection of land and sea was found to be very positive and original. However, it was decided to eliminate it at this stage due to the lack of a strong spatial impact in the proposed solution.

09. Shoreline Reflections: Mussel Memories (zt03011) The idea brought to the coastal strip, with its relationship between the inside and the outside, was found positive. However, the weakness of its relationship with the coast was criticized, and it was decided to eliminate it at this stage

18. Leak (zt53180) The discussion on ecological awareness and the idea itself were found to be important. However, it was not clear where the solutions expressed in the details existed, and some points indicated by diagrams were not understood in three dimensions. It was discussed that it was unclear what the idea had transformed into, and it was decided to eliminate it at this stage

23. Marine Discovery Center (zt04020) The pier approach was found to be very strong, and its connection to the land through the provided passage was positively received. Despite the contrast created with the colors and mass in relation to the coast, the ease of accessibility was considered a conscious choice. However, despite the quality brought to the pier, the lack of its connection with the sea and the decision to abandon its use as a pier, remaining both extending into the sea and unrelated to it, was criticized. It was decided to eliminate it in this round.

25. mutual.care (zt09957) The proposed idea was found valuable. The effort to relate two different elevations with the ground and create different spaces was appreciated. However, it was considered incomplete as it remained at the scale of landscape and environmental arrangement, and it was decided to eliminate it in this round.

26. Wellness on the coast (zt77707) The proposal related to the coast and the effort to manage the water at the river's mouth was found positive. However, the structure and bridge were considered exaggerated in scale, and it was decided to eliminate it in this round.

27. memory (zt40361) It was discussed that the idea was very good, but the poetic quality captured in the three-dimensional aspect on the lower left, followed by the use of the roof and the proposed idea's application, reached a very negative point and was found unfavorable. It was argued that while there were important thoughts and fine qualities in parts, these parts did not come together to form a cohesive whole, and it was decided to eliminate it in this round. The attempt for a transparent transition between the coast, the beach, and the life behind was evaluated as a very positive idea. However, it was decided to eliminate it in this round because it lost its connection to the coast beyond a certain point.

28. Myndos Experience Center (zt02412) The attempt at a transparent transition between the shore, the beach, and the life behind it was considered a very positive idea. However, it was decided to eliminate it in this round because it was deemed to have lost its presence on the shore after a certain point.

39. Portal (zt06780) The idea and the poetic effect in the visual were found to be very important; however, since it remained only at the idea stage, the fact that it was a work that created a sense of bewilderment between the sea and the land was valuable, but the lack of a relevant proposal was discussed. It was eliminated in this round because the effect attempted to be created with the mirror was trivialized, the scale was exaggerated with arches, and the strong poetic aspect could not be reflected in the space.

40. augmented thresholds (zt24524) The ecological concerns were found to be positive. However, it was decided to eliminate it in this round because it was not clear where the site plan led when followed, the proposals in the third dimension did not correspond to anything in the site plan, and the drawings did not indicate what was placed where.

43. Replication Nexus (zt73644) The consideration of the relationship with the shore was found to be positive, but the proposal was deemed to be without scale and unsuccessful in terms of space. It was decided to eliminate it in this round.

45. Music Instruments Museum in Amasra (zt16267) The mass design, interior transitions, relationship with the rock, solids and voids, sudden transition to the upper level, plan sections, and its relationship with Amasra and its history were found to be very important and very successful. However, the relationship it established with the shore was found to be very weak. It was eliminated in this round.

50. lighthouse for peace (zt37216) The final form was found to be effective, but the fact that its location was very uncertain was discussed as a significant drawback. It was considered weak because, while it was shown on the shore in the site plan, it appeared in the middle of the beach in three dimensions, leading to a lack of decision about its place. Although it had a very promising start, it was eliminated in this round because it was contextually disconnected and unrelated to the shore.

52. Unda (zt10104) It was not understood what kind of relationship there is between the linear line and the ground. The designed object was discussed as being incomprehensible, the reasons for the continuing lines being in that form were not understood, and the reasons for the connections were not understood. The plastic effect and the placement of concrete on the topography were found to be strong, but the lack of connectivity and causality was considered very weak. The failure in merging the curvilinear form with the straight line and the inability to form a coherent whole led to its elimination in this round.

57. wave (zt21358) The idea of extending a platform that appears very weak in the site plan to the village and then continuing it, feeding it with certain functions, was considered positive. However, it was ultimately found to be negative due to the platform being overly exaggerated on the village scale, leading to its elimination in this round.

69. Koyak (zt59143) The sensitive approach seen in the bottom right perspective not being reflected in the site plan was found to be negative. Although some of the spaces created had positive qualities, it was criticized for not forming a coherent whole, and it was decided to eliminate it in this round.

71. Ecological Responsiveness Hub (zt04531) The internal dynamics of the structure and its relationship with the shore were found to be positive. However, it was eliminated in this round due to the very weak relationship with the shore and the loss of some qualities while forming the shoreline.

72. Traces (zt23185) The architectural solutions of the spaces, the awareness of the topography, and the feeling of the sea were found to be positive in terms of scale. However, the balconies and terraces not leading to a conclusion, appearing as if they were left incomplete like a photo from the construction stage, were criticized. Despite its strong language, it was eliminated in this round due to issues with spatial values and the weakness of the plastic effect.

After the elimination of the above 21 projects, the remaining 7 projects were voted to proceed to the third evaluation round.

Third Evaluation Round –

The following 4 projects were eliminated in the second evaluation round with brief justifications as stated below:

02. The Edge (zt17453) The proposal to create spaces by breaking the scale was found to be successful, and it was noted that it had a very strong language. However, it was discussed that the strong situation in the third dimensions was not reflected in the site plan. The bridge proposal was found to be successful but was criticized for being over-designed. The initial idea was considered very important, but it was criticized for not belonging to the context and for not developing the found idea. It was decided to eliminate it in this round.

07. Fener (zt13876) The idea of leaving a mythical shore almost untouched was found to be successful, but it was criticized for not being a spatial proposal and remaining an observation. It was noted that it was a very sensitive observation indicating the space of the natural structure. The presentation was found to be very effective and expressive of its purpose, positively conveying the existing situation. The proposal for accessing the space was found to be positive, but no architectural proposal was found. It was criticized for expressing itself through writings rather than spatial formations, and it was decided to eliminate it at this stage.

21. Flaneur (zt21021) The urban shore proposal... considering the area itself and what has been done, the idea of opening the existing typology of the shore as a public space was found positive. However, the extensions' disconnection with the sea was found contrary to the concept and very forced, and their relationship with the existing texture was not questioned. It was found to be very heavy both in scale and space. The inability to draw the quantitative limit was found problematic. Everything being excessive was criticized. The relationship with the existing marinas was questioned but criticized for coming to the same point. It was considered to have no new response. It was found positive that it is a contextual solution, that it specified references, and responded to contemporary answers. However, it was criticized for not having a new proposal in relation to the shore. It transforms what was produced for the shipyard, but there is a scale problem. It is produced in an uncontrolled manner. The site plan was found very positive, but the scale in three dimensions was evaluated as missed, and it was decided to eliminate it at this stage.

44. Re-eef (zt15637) Starting with the idea of ecological concerns and attempting to lighten the existing shore by reducing it was found to be positive. However, it was discussed that the fractures and

multiplications made on the ground did not correspond in the third dimension. It was debated that the conceptual presentation and the application did not align, the fragmentations created an important composition but were incomplete, and the relationship with the shore was found to be weak. Consequently, it was decided to eliminate it at this stage.

Final Prize Ranking :

The jury mutually agreed to combine the final elimination and ranking in this round.

When seven projects were eliminated at the third stage, only three proposals remained for the final round. The jury asked all jury members to rank the remaining three projects to determine the first, second, and third places. However, the jury members could not reach a consensus on the ranking of any proposal. As a result, when discussing the positive and negative aspects of the proposals, it was acknowledged that all had very valuable designs but also had some drawbacks. It was decided to award an equivalent first prize to all three projects. The positive opinions, criticisms, and deficiencies regarding the three projects are detailed below in the design explanations.

33. beginning living ending (zt35017) The proposal was found to be very strong. While the chronological structure was not very important, the structural diversity it brought about in space transformations, its approach to scale and the shore, were positively received. The proposal was detailed enough to express its idea effectively. Its ability to present contrasts in a very calm manner and its awareness regarding the sea and the shore were appreciated. Although there were weaknesses in the architectural formation of the pier, it was unanimously awarded an equivalent first prize.

34. threshold (zt12029) Achieving a very sensitive result with minimal intervention, making it look as if it occurred naturally, was found to be very effective and balanced in its relationship with the existing rock, topography, and sea. It was noted to have a poetic effect, and the chosen viewpoints to explain the idea were found to be very successful. However, the break in the language created at the point of the shelter was considered a negative aspect. Despite this, it was unanimously awarded an equivalent first prize.

79. Coast (zt40108) The beach structure extending into the sea as a pier was found to be a very effective idea in terms of transformation with time and space, and the chosen location was considered very bold. The gaps in between and the perspectives chosen to convey the idea were found to be very successful. It was discussed that, as a whole, it was very impactful and had a poetic effect. The proposal for the use of the pier was considered very valuable for bringing a new understanding. However, it was criticized for being left incomplete despite having a lot of potential to transform into a space, and for there being no significant difference between what was made by nature and what was made by human hands. It was also discussed what would remain when nature deteriorated what was built. Despite these issues, its realization of what it intended to say and its ability to belong to nature were found to be very positive. It was unanimously awarded an equivalent first prize.